



special
collections
DOUGLAS
Library



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

CITY LATIN,
OR,
CRITICAL and POLITICAL
R E M A R K S
ON THE
LATIN INSCRIPTION

On laying the FIRST STONE of the intended
NEW BRIDGE at *Black-Fryars*.

[Price One Shilling.]

MY LADY

TO

THE LADY OF THE

ARMY

BY

THE LADY OF THE

ARMY

CITY LATIN,
OR,
Critical *and* Political REMARKS
ON THE
LATIN INSCRIPTION
ON
LAYING THE FIRST STONE
OF THE INTENDED
NEW BRIDGE
At BLACK-FRYARS.

Proving almost every Word of it to be erroneous,
And contrary to the Practice of both ANCIENTS and
MODERNS in this Kind of WRITING:

Interspersed with curious Reflections on
ANTIQUES AND ANTIQUITY.

With a PLAN or PATTERN for a
NEW INSCRIPTION.

Dedicated to the Venerable SOCIETY OF ANTIQUARIES.

BY THE REV. BUSBY BIRCH,

L. L. D. F. R. S. F. A. S. F. C. C. and M. S. E. A. M. C. *i. e.*
Member of the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manu-
factures and Commerce.

*Quis expedit Salmasio suam Hundredam,
Picamque docuit verba nostra conari?* MILTON.

L O N D O N,
Printed for R. STEVENS, at Pope's-Head in
Paternoster-Row, 1760.

AC94.1760.T56

AC 94.1760.T56

AC 94.1760.T56

AC 94.1760.T56

AC 94.1760.T56

AC 94.1760.T56

AC 94.1760.T56

AC 94.1760.T56

AC 94.1760.T56

AC 94.1760.T56

AC 94.1760.T56

AC 94.1760.T56

AC 94.1760.T56



R E M A R K S

ON THE

LATIN INSCRIPTION, &c.

THOUGH I cannot but applaud the Zeal and Affection, which our worthy Citizens of *London* have expressed towards the GREAT MINISTER, in their Inscription on laying the first Stone of the new Bridge, yet I could wish they had been contented with expressing it in their own native Language; which will probably last as long as the Bridge, though built on *Elliptic* Arches.

B

There

There were doubtless among them Persons of sufficient Abilities for such a Task: Witness the late Address of the Lord Mayor and Aldermen; witness the Address of the Common Council; witness the Address of the Merchants; all which, we may venture to say, will not be outdone by the Addressees of any other Mayors, Aldermen, and Corporations, or even of our two Universities. Where then was the Necessity, that the Inscription in Question should be couched in an unknown Tongue? Unknown we may call it to most of our Citizens, whose Knowledge in *Latin* scarce extends further than the famed *Ashley's* Motto, *Pro bono publico*; though it must be allowed, that many of them are conversant in the *French*, *Spanish*, *Italian*, *German*, *High Dutch*, *Low Dutch*, and HEBREW.

I know not, whether this *Latin* Inscription, (if it may be called *Latin*) was drawn up by my Lord Mayor's Chaplain, or the Master of *Merchant Taylor's*, or *Paul's School*, or even the *Charter-House*; but the following Remarks

marks will, I think, sufficiently prove the Author to be wholly ignorant of classical Latinity, and an entire Stranger to the usual Stile of Inscriptions.

But it will be necessary, in order to refresh the Reader's Memory, that I should transcribe this Inscription, together with it's *English* Translation, as it has appeared in the public Papers: Though there is great Reason to imagine, that it was originally first drawn up in *English*, by some learned *Deputy* or other, and afterwards *done into Latin*, as the Phrase is; which, if this be the Case, will readily account for the many *Anglicisms* that occur in it.

Ultimo die Octobris, anno ab incarnatione

MDCCLX.

auspicatissimo principe GEORGIO Tertio

regnum jam ineunte,

pontis hujus, in reipublicæ commodum,

urbisq; majestatem,

(late tum flagrante bello)

a S. P. Q. L. suscepti,

primum lapidem posuit

THOMAS CHITTY, Miles,

Prætor :

ROBERTO MYLNE, Architecto.

Utque apud posteros extet monumentum

voluntatis suæ erga virum,

qui vigore ingenii, animi constantia,

probitatis & virtutis suæ felici quadam contagione,

(favente Deo

faustisque GEORGII Secundi auspiciis)

imperium Britannicum

in Asia, Africa, & America,

restituit, auxit, & stabilivit,

ne non patriæ antiquum honorem & auctoritatem

inter Europæ gentes instauravit;

cives Londinenses, uno consensu,

huic ponti inscribi voluerunt nomen

GULIELMI PITT,

Englished

Englished thus.

On the last Day of October, in the Year 1760,
and in the Beginning of the most auspicious Reign of
GEORGE the Third,

Sir THOMAS CHITTY, Knight, Lord Mayor,
laid the first Stone of this Bridge,
Undertaken by the Common Council of London,
(amidst the Rage of an extensive War)
for the publick Accommodation,
and Ornament of the City :

ROBERT MYLNE being the Architect.
And that there might remain to Posterity
a Monument of this City's Affection to the Man,
who, by the Strength of his Genius,
the Steadiness of his Mind,
and a certain Kind of happy Contagion of his
Probity and Spirit,
(under the Divine Favour,
and fortunate Auspices of GEORGE the Second)
recovered, augmented, and secured,
the British Empire
in Asia, Africa, and America,
And restored the ancient Reputation
and Influence of his Country
amongst the Nations of Europe ;

The Citizens of London have unanimously voted this
Bridge to be inscribed with the Name of
WILLIAM PITT.

Ultimo

Ultimo die Octobris.

The last Day of October: This is a very bald Expression, and but little removed from a downright *Anglicism*. *Die Octobris xxxi.* would have been more in the Inscription Taste, which delights in Numerals: But, if they must have it *the LAST Day*, *postremo* is undoubtedly the classical Word; and, as Elegance of Construction should be particularly regarded in these little Things, it should also have been placed after *Die Octobris*, and not before it. *Die Octobris postremo.* It is strange, that when *postero*, or *posteriore*, might have served instead of a better Word, that the Author should unluckily pitch upon poor *Ultimo*.

Anno ab incarnatione.

If our Author had known any Thing of Precision, he would certainly have added N. S. J. C. *i. e.* *Nostri Salvatoris Jesu Christi*, which would likewise have
looked

looked very pretty, since nothing in Works of this Kind is so pretty as single Capitals. But why could not simply *Anno Domini* have served his Turn, as Brevity is no less to be consulted in Inscriptions? I suppose he was afraid, lest Posterity should mistake it for the *Year of the Lord Mayor*. However, if the Author had been the least acquainted with the Custom of the *Romans* on these Occasions, he might have borrowed a very elegant Phrase from them, I mean, *Anno urbis conditæ*, which would have preserved to Posterity the precise *Æra*, when the City of *London* was first built; and this, there is no doubt, might have been accurately fixed by the *Antiquarian Society*, assisted in their Enquiries by the Ruins of the City-Gates.

MDCCLX.

It may seem odd, that I should find Fault with these innocent Letters; but Preciseness obliges me to point out, that they are never applied in this Manner in
Latin

Latin Inscriptions. Had the Author but dipped into *Montfaucon's* or *Graevius's Antiquities*, or even *Stow's Survey of London*, he would have found, that, instead of CC, he should have used CIO, and the least Observation would have informed him, that a Point or Dot was necessary after some of the Letters, as thus, M.D.CIO.LX. The Virtuoso's Eye must be as much hurt by the vulgar MDCCLX, as it would be by the barbarous *Arabic* Numerals 1760.

Auspicatissimo Principe GEORGIO *Tertio*
Regnum jam ineunte.

Auspicatissimo, (the most auspicious) besides being a most egregious Anglicism, is, at best, but a very doubtful Compliment to his present Majesty. I have looked into *Holyoak's* Dictionary, as it is vulgarly called, though the first, and best Impression, properly styles it, *Vocabularium a Sancto Quercu*. There I find *Auspicatus*, [*ab Auspicium*] *auspicious*, malo sensu frequenter usitat. Omen auspicatum, *i. e.* Corvor. Cic.

Auspicata Mulier. PLAUT. **A bad Woman.** Now, among the most numerous and most illustrious Tribe of *issimi*, could not the Author have culled out some choice Epithet of the superlative Degree, that would not be liable to a double Meaning? Surely he might have met with *pick and chuse* in Abundance, from the Dedications to foreign Potentates; such as in those to the *French King*, *Christianissimo*, to the *Spanish*, *Catholicissimo*, to his Holiness the Pope, *Sacro-Sanctissimo*. But the Epithet, that might at once have occurred to our Author, as most suitable to his present Majesty's Character, (and, I am sure, every one will agree with me) is OPTIMO.

To proceed Our Author is so desirous of setting down at length, what ought to be expressed in Figures only, (contrary to the known Rules of Inscription-Writing) that here again he must substitute *GEORGIO Tertio*, instead of *GEORGIO III.* as he would needs have *Ultimo Die Octobris*, in the Room

of *Die Oëtobris XXXI.* I ask him, did he ever see *Tertius* or *Secundus* upon an Halfpenny, a Coin the nearest approaching to the Copper Medals of the *Cæsars*? No. Even *Carolus II.* who would not stile himself either *II.* or *Secundus*, (for Fear, I suppose, of offending the Puritans) elegantly stamped himself, on his earliest Coins, *Carolus a Carolo*; and I could not have blamed our Author, if, instead of lengthening out *III.* to *Tertio*, he had further extended it into *Georgio a Friderico a Georgio a Georgio*.

Regnum jam ineunte.

It is hoped, that the News-papers, Magazines, and other faithful Histories of the present Times, will convince Posterity, that his Majesty King *George the Third* was, on the last Day of *October*, 1760, actually in the Kingdom; otherwise, from the above Expression, they might naturally conclude the contrary, since *regnum jam ineunte* can only be construed, *just now coming into the Kingdom*;

dom; and should the unfortunate *Tertio*, in the Line above, happen to be defaced or worn out, Posterity will be apt to imagine, that the Bridge began to be built at the Time that *George the First* landed on the *English* Shore from *Hanover*.

*Pontis hujus, in reipublicæ commodum,
Urbisque majestatem.*

Here again my Friend *Holyoak* must be called in to inform our Author, that the Preposition *in*, with an Accusative Case following it, generally signifies *against*, and not *for*; so that the Sense of this Passage might be, that the Bridge was set on Foot, *to the Detriment of the Publick, and derogatory of the Majesty of the City of London*. Nor would this Interpretation appear strange, considering the great Disputes that have arisen about the Form and Construction of its Arches. But allowing this Sentence to bear a good Meaning, it is certainly necessary to make a slight Transposition of the

Words thus....*In reipublicæ majestatem, urbisque commodum*.... for every one must agree with me, that the Bridge is undoubtedly erected *for the Accommodation of the City*.

Before I have done with this Passage, I must remark, that every *classic* Eye must be offended with seeing *reipublicæ* spelt at length, and made only one Word of; whereas it ought to have been split in two, or, at least, contracted to *reip.* or *reipubl.* or to *Rpublicæ*, or simply *R. P.* which latter is perhaps the most elegant Way of writing it, as it is certainly the most ancient, and (what must further recommend it) consists only of Capitals.

Latè tum flagrante bello.

What must Posterity suppose from this Sentence, (which is put in a Parenthesis, and might indeed be better omitted) but that the Bridge was built purely *on Account of the War?* And can they conceive any other Reason, but that it
was

was merely designed for the Conveniency only of the Trained-Bands crossing the Water? Otherwise, what signifies it, whether the Bridge was built in War-Time or in Peace? Suppose our worthy Citizens had set about it at the Time of the last dreadful Fire by *St. Magnus Church*, the Inscription, in that Case, might have run....*Latè tum flagrante IGNI*....and this too with some Shadow of a Meaning, as it might have been supposed, that the Espousers of *Black-fryars Bridge* thereby meant to express their secret Wish, that the Fire might reach as far as its Antagonist, the Temporary Bridge. But, after all, what has *tum* to do in this Passage? Is it placed there to signify, that the War raged on the last Day of *October* particularly, or at the very Instant of my Lord-Mayor's laying the first Stone?

Pontis hujus

a S. P. Q. L. suscepti.

Here the Author has for once awkwardly attempted to copy the Usage of the Ancients on their publick Inscriptions. Every School-Boy can tell him, that S. P. Q. R. signifies the whole State of *Rome*, that is, the Senate and the People: But let us examine, whether S. P. Q. L. comprehends the whole City of *London*. Now it is well known, that the Commonwealth of *Rome* was made up only of two Bodies, to wit, the Senate and the People; whereas the City is composed of,

1. The Lord-Mayor, or *Prætor*.
2. The Aldermen, or *Aldermanni*,
(there being no *Latin* Term equal to their Dignity.)
3. The Common Council Men, or
Communis Concilii Fratres.
4. The ordinary Freemen, or *Liberti*.

Therefore

Therefore the above Capitals are not sufficient to denote this extensive Corporation, but they should stand thus:

a P. A. C. C. F. L. Q. L.

i. e. *Prætoris, Aldermannis, Communis Concilii Fratibus, Libertisq; Londinensibus.* And how much more noble do these numerous Capitals look (*P. A. C. C. F. L. Q. L.*) than the sneaking *S. P. Q. R.* of the *Romans!*

But what are we to understand by *Pontis suscepti*? Let us again consult *Holyoak*, and he will inform us, that *suscipere opus* may signify, *to undertake any Work*, but *suscipere onus*, to undertake, or *suscipere pontem*, must have a different Construction; and *Pontis a S. P. Q. L. suscepti*, in this Place, can only be understood, *that the Lord-Mayor, Aldermen, Common Council, and Citizens, took up the Bridge on their Shoulders, and carried it clean off.*

Primum Lapidem posuit

THOMAS CHITTY, *Miles,*

Prætor:

ROBERTO MYLNE *Architecto.*

The superficial common Scholar will hardly conceive, that any Mistakes can possibly have been made in this plain and simple Sentence; but any one, who is conversant in the Method of Inscriptions, will discover many Blunders.

I am credibly informed, that the first Plate, on which the Inscription was engraved, was obliged to be laid aside, on Account of the Engraver, who did not understand *Latin*, cutting the Line *Tho^s. Chitty Miles*, (as one Name) instead of, *Thomas Chitty, Miles*: And no Wonder, that the ignorant Artist should commit such a Blunder, when the Manuscript had it originally *Tho^s.* a barbarous Abbreviation of *Thomas*, and the Word *Dominus*, as *Latin* for *Sir*, (i. e. *Knight*) instead of *Miles*. But does not any one see, that *Chitty* should have

have been *Chittius*, or rather *Chitteius*, as in the next Line *Mylne* should be *Mylnio*, *Thomas Chitteius*, *Roberto Mylnio*? It is, indeed, a Pity, that these Words will not bear to be converted into true *Latin*, like my Friend *Holyoak* into *Sanctus Quercus*; or, as the Rev. *George White* stiled himself *Agricola Candidus*. But, as this cannot be, they ought, at least, to have a *Latin Termination*; and every Judge of Antiquity will agree with me, that, without this Addition, these Names would sound no better than *Tom Chitty* and *Bob Mylne*.

*Utque apud Posterios extet Monumentum
Voluntatis suæ ergà Virum.*

Voluntatis suæ: It is hard to determine, whether this means the *Bridge's* Affection, or *Thomas Chitty's* and *Robert Mylne's*, whose Names immediately go before; but it is obvious, that in the first Line the Author has a double Meaning, and intends a Compliment to one of the City Structures.... *Ut apud*

D

Posterios

Posteror extet MONUMENTUM; that the MONUMENT may stand to Posterity. In Return for this patriotic Wish, I would propose, that, as some have idly conceived a Prejudice against *Elliptic* Arches, (the most strong and beautiful of any) this Line should be fixed on the Center Arch, with a slight Alteration,

APUD POSTEROS EXTET PONS.

*Qui vigore ingenii, animi constantiâ,
Probitatis & virtutis suæ felici quadam
contagione.*

The first Line might have been this, that, or t'other; but, in the Name of *Latin*, what is this *felici quadam contagione*? By a certain Kind of a Sort of an happy Contagion of what? *probitatis et virtutis suæ* . . . his own Probitity and Virtue. Stay . . . I shall wear out poor *Holyoak*, having used him at, and ever since I left, School . . . but no Matter . . . let me see . . . oh . . . *Contagio*, f. [*a contactus, contangere*] *Contagion* . . . Now for his Instances . . . *Abis* contagionem

gionem spirat. TER. And many others, not one of which but gives the Word in a bad Sense. But even allowing that *Contagio* may be taken in a good Sense, as it is qualified with the Epithet of *felix*, the Line, after twisting and winding it which Way you please, can only be understood, that Mr. Pitt *caught the happy Contagion of his own Probity and Spirit*. But the Author undoubtedly intended an Innuendo by this Passage, that the Lord-Mayor, Aldermen, and the rest of the Citizens, were *infected* with the same Probity and Spirit.

*Imperium Britannicum
in Asia, Africa, et America,
restituit, auxit, et stabilivit.*

From the Order of the Words, and from the common Method observed in Inscriptions, Posterity will doubtless conceive, that the Author meant to particularize the different Success of our Arms in different Parts of the Globe; and they will naturally understand this

Passage as follows: *In Asiâ restituit, in Africâ auxit, in Americâ stabilivit*; he recovered the *British* Empire in *Asia*, he augmented it in *Africa*, he secured it in *America*. Every body knows, that Inscriptions should be as plain as possible, and the least liable to have their Sense mistaken: I therefore cannot suppose, that our Author should depart from this known Rule, but rather imagine, that some officious would-be-critic foisted in this Line about *Asia*, *Africa*, and *America*, because *Europe* happens to come in the next Sentence, and he was willing to have all the four Quarters of the Globe together. I am convinced, that our Author would rather have brought in all the four Winds, and have written it, *In Euro, in Borea, in Austro, &c.*

*Necnon patriæ antiquum honorem et
auctoritatem*

Inter Europæ gentes instauravit.

A little Lad, a Relation of mine,
who is in the third Form at *Westminster*
School,

School, happened to call upon me, just as I had finished my last Remark. I set him to construe this Passage. He began . . . *Nec non*, also . . . *instauravit*, he, he, he, [restored, Child!] restored . . . *antiquum honorem*, the ancient Honour . . . *et auctoritatem*, and the Authority . . . [Good Boy! wonderful!] . . . *patriæ* . . . [Well!] of their Countries . . . [*their* Countries, Child?] . . . Yes, Uncle, *inter Europæ gentes*, among the Nations of *Europe*. Upon my Word, the Boy set the Passage in a different Light to what perhaps I should have seen it in; and Posterity must consider our Great Patriot as the Patriot of all Countries, Foes or Friends, when they understand, from this Sentence, (as it cannot be well construed otherwise) *that he restored the ancient Honour and Authority [not only of his own, but] of each their several respective Countries to all the Nations of Europe.* Had, indeed, the little Word *suæ* here happened to have slipped in . . . *patriæ suæ antiquum honorem & auctoritatem*, &c. it would have given the Sentence that Meaning
which

which the Author doubtless intended it should convey. Let us, however, be good-natured enough to suppose, that he could not possibly have missed hitting upon this necessary Word, but that either he or the Engraver, through Hurry or Inadvertency, left it out.

*Cives Londinenses, uno consensu,
huic Ponti inscribi voluerunt nomen
GULIELMI PITT.*

It cannot be sufficiently lamented, that the Inscription throughout is so entirely devoid of the genuine Marks of just and classical Composition. I have pointed out the egregious Ignorance of the Author, in this Kind of Writing, in his very first Line, *in vestibulo*, as it were; and he has shewn no less Ignorance in the Conclusion. *Cives Londinenses* . . . What a Pity 'tis, that he had not made Use of that magnificent Range of Capitals, P. A. C. C. F. L. Q. L. as before recommended! but how shocking is it, that the Ignorant has not had

Reading

Reading enough to know, that the Letters C. L. (nothing more than C. L.) were more full, more expressive, more intelligible, and more *inscriptive* by themselves, than with the useless Addition of *ives ondinenses!*

The common Reader will hardly imagine, that I should be able to spy out any Mistake in the last Line, *Gulielmi Pitt*; but I hope to prove, to the Satisfaction of every Body, at least of every *Antiquary*, that the Author is wrong in both the *Christian* and *Surname* of this Gentleman. First then, it is well known, that the Word *Gulielmi* was never used in Inscriptions, except upon the barbarous modern Medals, or Coins, of King *William* the Third. I wonder the Author did not write it, *Williami*, which is certainly as good *Latin* for *William*, as this strange *Gulielmi*; at least, he might have *barbaro-latinized* it into *Wilbelmi*, or (as the chaste *Roman* Alphabet abhorred a VV or W) called it *Vilbelmi*. But, if it must be something like *Gulielmi*, is it not notorious, that

it should be spelt *Guilelmi* and not *Gulielmi*, as it is vulgarly and ignorantly written?

But to come to the Name *Pitt*
O what a glorious Opportunity was here let slip of naturalizing an *English* Name into the *Latin* Tongue, by a *Latinization* of it! . . . *Pitt! Pitt!* a low *English* Word! *Sink, Ditch, Bog, Quagmire*, would sound equally noble. But if, instead of this, it had been written *Fossa*, how grandly would that have sounded! And, surely, every Admirer of antique Learning will agree with me, that *Fossa! Guilelmi Fossæ!* . . . would have made the illustrious Name of the *Fossas* adored and remembered to all Posterity.

As to the Objection, which will possibly be raised, that Posterity may perhaps apprehend the Word *Fossa* to mean *Ditch* instead of *Pitt*, that can have no Force at all, as they will easily find, that though *Will Pitt* was at the Head of the Ministry at this present Time, there was no such Person joined with him in the Administration, as *Will Ditch*.

Ditch. It is true, indeed, that the City formerly joined *two* Names together in the Presentation of their Freedom and Gold Boxes: It might therefore be a Matter of some Wonder, that they did not think fit to couple them on the present Occasion, and at the same Time that they immortalized *Guilelmus Fossa*, they did not pay the same Honours to *Henricus Bilsonus Crus*.

And now I have touched upon the Subject of converting *English* Proper Names into *Latin*, I shall beg Leave to enlarge upon it a little further, and to shew its peculiar Elegance and Propriety. We cannot but be sensible, that most of our *English* Names, which have any Meaning at all, are borrowed from the lowest, and sometimes the most ridiculous, as well as offensive Objects. Thus, for Instance, what can be more shocking to a delicate Ear, than *Mangey*, *Rag*, *Belcher*, *Gorge*, *Grub*, *Trollop*, *Nanny*, *Huffey*, &c. &c. &c. Not to mention some others that border very nearly on Indecency. Many, again,

E

take

take their Appellations from the lowest Tradesmen and Mechanics; such as *Smith, Mason, Gardener, Packer, Dyer, Turner, Taylor, Cook, Cooper, Carter, Draper, Glover, Butcher, Plumber, Painter, Carpenter, &c.* Almost all Kinds of Beasts, Birds, and Fishes, are also to be found among us; as *Buck, Stag, Hart, Hind, Fox, Hare, Bull, Bullock, Lamb; Duck, Drake, Gosling, Crow, Hawk, Kite, Heron, Crane, Parrot, Partridge, Cock, Woodcock; Sprat, Herring, Crab, Whiting, Salmon, &c.* The four Quarters of the Wind, *East, West, North, and South*, are also frequently used as Surnames; and almost all the Colours of the Rainbow are appropriated to the same Purposes; as *Green, Scarlet, Grey, Brown, Black, Blackall, Blackmore, White, Whitehead, Redhead, &c.* Even the different Parts of our Habitations furnish us with no inconsiderable Number of Names: We have *House, Garden, Court, Wall, Hall, Kitchen, Garret, Stair, Chambers, Wood, Stone, Lock, Key, Street, Lane, &c.*

We

We have also *Fields, Meadows, Rivers, Lakes, Ponds, Pools, Dykes, Hedges, &c.* in Abundance. Some Parts of the Body likewise serve for the same End; as *Head, Scull, Leg, Foot, Trotter, &c.* But why need I dwell any longer on this Subject? There are *Rich* and *Poor, Sharp* and *Blunt, Young* and *Eld, Long* and *Short, Small* and *Great, Walker* and *Rider, Swift, Hastings, and On-slow;* with a Variety of other Names taken from the most common Actions of our Lives.

Let us then suppose, that these Names, or the most vulgar and disagreeable of them, were to be changed into *Latin*: It would perhaps be objected, that the Words in either Language would still bear the same Import; yet it must be allowed, that the Sound being altered, the Ear is not so immediately shocked, or the Mind so directly struck with the Vulgariness or Indelicacy of their Meaning. For Instance, though the Name *Belcher* should of Right belong to nobody but a *Dutchman*, the *Latin* Word *Eruētator*

greatly alleviates the Filthiness of its Meaning by the Magnificence of its Sound : At least, it would not be inferior to the Title of that Emperor, who laid a Tax on a certain natural Evacuation, and was thence, by his Flatterers, stiled *Urinator*. Besides, there are a great many *English* Names, that nearly resemble those of the most illustrious Families and Offices in old *Rome*: Thus the *Smiths*, by a very fair Allusion, might be stiled FABRICII, the *Gardeners* HORTENSII, the *Tailors* SARTORII, the *Drapers* TOGATI, the *Masons* ÆDILES, &c. &c. &c. So, in other Instances, *Long* would be readily converted into LONGINUS, as *Short* would be CURTIUS, *Great* or *Greathead* might be called MAXIMUS, or CAPITO MAXIMUS; *Young* (especially the Reverend Satirist of that Name) would not be improperly stiled JUVENALIS, as *Eld* or *Oldham* might fairly make SENECA: *Swift* or *Hastings* is FESTINUS, and *On-slow* directly answers to LENTULUS. So also among the Colours, *White* may be

be either ALBIUS or CANDIDUS, as *Black* or *Blackall* may at once assume the Title of the Emperor NIGER: And pray what is FUSCUS, to whom *Horace* addresses one of his Odes, but downright *Brown*? Suppose, therefore, a Gentleman of the Name of *Wenman* or *Warton*, would he not be proud to be called after CICERO, who received that Name on Account of a *Wen* or *Wart* growing on one Side of his Face? And the *Italian* Musician, whom the Courtesy of the Galleries have, in a Manner, naturalized by the Appellation of *Nosy*, would, I believe, very readily exchange it for that of the Poet NASO; whom we may conclude to have been so called for the very same Reason, if we consider his supposed Intimacy with a certain Lady of the first Fashion in his Time.

But the Utility of this Proceeding is still further evident from the Practice of other Nations in Affairs of this Kind. The *French*, perhaps conscious of the Lightness and Futility of their own Language, always make Use of this
Manner

Manner of Writing on their public Monuments; and their famous *Academy of Inscriptions*, &c. was established for scarce any other Purpose, than to find out proper *Latin* Words for the Names of those illustrious Personages, who are, by these Means, to be immortalized. Thus, on a Medal struck in Memory of their famous Poet *Racine*, that Word signifying a *Root*, they have called him *Radix*; on another, in Honour of the two *Corneilles*, Father and Son, they have been contented, by a slight Mutation, to stile them *Cornelii Pat. et Fil. i. e. Pater et Filius*; but, I am informed, they are preparing another also for the Son of the latter, on which is to be inscribed the Classical Name of CORNELIUS NEPOS... *Nepos*, in their Language, signifying the *Petit-Fils* or *Grandson*.

The *Dutch* (who have always preserved a true Taste for Compositions of this Kind, as well as for the finest Branch of Criticism, that of emending Letters) are very accurate in the Trans-

lations of their excellent *Dutch* Names into *Latin*. One Instance may suffice for all. In the Church of *Rotterdam*, on the Monument of that famous Burgo-Master, (the first Projector of Stock-Broking) *Wynheer Wan Bugger Bugger, Wiggledy Wiggledy, Helter Skelter*, he is concisely stiled, in the most elegant *Latinity* . . . *Omnium Gatherum*.

Having then these great Examples before our Eyes, what should hinder this Nation, which, though slow at Invention, is ever ready at Improvement, from making itself equally remarkable for its Taste in similar Undertakings. A noble Opportunity offers itself in the public Monument shortly to be erected; and, if the Inscription concerning a City Bridge must be in *Latin*, the Inscription on this Monument will undoubtedly be in the same Language: At least it ought to be so, if for no other Reason, than that the Name of *Wolf* will admit to be *latinized* into *Lupus*.

But to return from this Digression....
As I have found so much Fault with
the

the present Form of the *City Inscription*, I may be asked, perhaps, what other would I substitute in its stead? To this I answer.... If we would consult Elegance, Clearness, Strength, and Brevity of Expression, if we would follow the usual Practice in these Cases, it should certainly run somewhat in the following Manner.

NON. VIII. MENS.

A.U.C. MM.C.LXX.IX.

T. CHITTEIO PR.

PONT.

A P. A. C. C. F. L. Q. L. CONSTR.

LAP. P. P.

What can be more plain and intelligible than this? What can look nobler and more significant than this? An Antiquarian could hang over it with Rapture for Hours, nay Years together, and find out the Beauty of every single Capital. But, as the Author of the prolix and wordy *City Inscription* will doubtless

doubtless be puzzled to get at its Meaning, I will condescend to become a Decypherer to his Ignorance.

NON. VIII. MENS. *Nonis Octavi Mensis*, on the Nones of the Eighth Month, that is, *October* 31.

If we look, indeed, into the *Roman* Calendar, as adapted to ours, at the End of the Dictionaries, we shall find it differently set down; but, alas! the Editors have never considered the *Alteration of the Style*.

A.U.C. MM.C.LXX.IX. *Anno Urbis Conditæ*, in the Year from the first Building of the City, 2179.

The Date of this *Æra* is modestly set down from authentic Records; but there are Traces of its Foundation much earlier; though it does not appear that the Mayors were called *Lords*, or that any of the Citizens were *Knighted*, till a long while after this Period.

T. CHITTEIO PR. *Thomâ Chitteio Præto*re, *Thomas Chitty* being Mayor.

Though no one can be better affected to his Majesty than myself; yet I thought

it unnecessary, in a City Inscription, to mention the Time of his *beginning to reign*, especially if no other Expression can be found, than *regnum jam ineunte*. It is sufficient to remark the precise Date by the Manner I have done; from the Year of the first Building of the City: But if this should be uncertain, authentic Records will fully prove it, by informing Posterity in what Year *Thomas Chitty* was Mayor; and, as to *Georgio Tertio regnum jam ineunte*, it might as well have been said *Thomas Chitty Mayoralitum jam exeunte*, *Thomas Chitty* just going out of his Mayoralty.

PONT. AC. C. F. L. Q. L. CONSTR.
LAP. P. P. *Pontis a Prætoze, Alderman-
nis, &c.* (as explained before) *construendi
Lapis primus ponebatur*, of a Bridge to
be built by the Mayor, Aldermen, &c.
the first Stone was laid.... This is clear,
short, and significant.... But, you will
say, as a Compliment to Mr. *Pitt* is
necessary, how is that to be expressed?
Why in the same concise and intelligible
Manner:

GUIL.

GUIL. FOSSÆ.
PATR. PATRIÆ D.D.D.

Is there any Occasion to explain these Letters? *Guilelmo Fossæ Patri Patriæ Datur, Dicatur, Dedicatur*, Dedicated to *William Pitt*, the Father of his Country.

It is now high Time to have done with this dry and uninteresting Subject; for so it may appear to all, who are not conversant in Antiquity: And though I could easily have confirmed my Remarks by numerous Quotations from ancient and modern Authors and Critics, yet I chuse rather to leave it to the true Virtuoso to determine, whether my Criticisms are just or groundless. I shall only observe further, that, as the Inscription, which has given rise to this little Work, is said to have been engraven on *pure Tin*, I think, with more Propriety, it might have been upon *pure Lead*.

F I N I S.

PATENT OFFICE

Is there any objection to the
 Patent Office being established
 in the District of Columbia
 to which the Patent Office
 is now removed from the
 City of Washington
 It is now proposed to remove
 the Patent Office to the
 District of Columbia
 for the purpose of
 concentrating the
 business of the
 Patent Office
 in one place
 and to have
 the Patent Office
 in the District of
 Columbia
 It is now proposed to
 remove the Patent Office
 to the District of
 Columbia
 for the purpose of
 concentrating the
 business of the
 Patent Office
 in one place
 and to have
 the Patent Office
 in the District of
 Columbia







